1490 ... 34

A DISCOURSE

[illegible]

TRANSUBSTANTIATION

THE FIFTH EDITION

[illegible] LONDON,

[illegible] against the Royal [illegible] And [illegible] Rogers, at the Sun, [illegible] Church [illegible] Fleetstreet, 1685.

A DISCOURSE AGAINST TRANSUBSTANTIATION

CConcerning the *Sacrament* of the *Lord's Supper*, one of the two great positive *Institutions* of the *Christian* Religion, there are two main Points of difference between *Us* and the Church of *Rome*. *One*, about the Doctrine of *Transubstantiation*; in which they think, but are not certain, that they have the Scripture and the words of our Saviour on their side: The *other*, about the administration of this Sacrament to the People in both kinds; in which we are sure that we have the Scripture and our Saviour's *Institution* on our side; and that so plainly, that our Adversaries themselves do not deny it.

Of the *first* of these *I* shall now treat, and endeavour to shew against the Church of *Rome*, *That in this Sacrament there is no substantial change made of the Elements of Bread and Wine into the natural Body and Blood of Christ*; that *Body* which was born of the *Virgin Mary*, and suffered upon the Cross; for so they explain that hard word *Transubstantiation*.

Before *I* engage in this Argument, *I* cannot but observe what an unreasonable task we are put upon, by the bold confidence of our Adversaries, to dispute a matter of Sense; which is one of these things about which *Aristotle* hath long since pronounc'd there ought to be no dispute.

It might well seem strange if any man should write a Book, to prove that an Egg is not an Elephant, and that a Musket Bullet is not a Pike: It is every white as hard a case, to be put to maintain by a long Discourse, that what we see and handle and taste to be Bread is Bread, and not the Body of a man; and what we see and taste to be Wine is Wine, and not Blood. And if this evidence may not pass for sufficient without any further proof, I do not see why any man, that hath confidence enough to do so, may not deny any thing to be what all the world sees it is; or affirm any thing to be what all the World sees it is not; and this without all possibility of being farther confuted. So that the business of *Transubstantiation* is not a controversie of Scripture, against Scripture, or of Reason against Reason, but of the downright impudence against the plain meaning of Scripture, and all Sense and

It is a most Self-evident Falsehood; and there is no Doctrine or Proposition in the World that is of it self more evidently true, than *Transubstantiation* is evidently false: And yet if it were possible to be true it would be the most ill-natur'd and pernicious truth in the World, because it would suffer nothing else to be true; it is like the *Roman-Catholick* Church, which will needs be the whole Christian Church, and will allow no other Society of Christians to be any part of it: So *Transubstantiation*, if it be true at all, it is all truth; for it cannot be true unless our Senses and the Senses of all Mankind be deceived about their proper objects; and if this be true and certain, then nothing else can be so; for if we be not certain of what we see, we can be certain of nothing.

And yet notwithstanding all this, there is a Company of men in the World so abandon'd and given up by God to the efficacy of delusion as in good earnest to believe this gross and palpable Errour, and to impose the belief of it upon the Christian World under no less penalties than of temporal death and Eternal damnation. And therefore to undeceive, if possible, these deluded Souls, it will be necessary to examine the pretended grounds of so false a Doctrine, and to lay open the monstrous absurdity of it.

And in the handling of this Argument, I shall proceed in this this plain method.

I. I shall consider the pretended grounds and reasons of the Church of Rome for this Doctrine.

II. I shall produce our *Objections* against *it*. And if I can shew that there is no tollerable ground for it, and that there are invincible Objections against it, then every man is not only in reason excused from the believing this Doctrine, but hath great cause to believe the contrary.

I. *First*, I consider the pretended grounds and reasons of the Church of *Rome* for this Doctrine. Which must be one or more of these *five*. Either 1st. The Authority of Scripture. Or 2ly. The perpetual belief of this Doctrine in the Christian Church, as an evidence that they always understood and interpreted our Saviour's words, *This is my Body*, in this sense. Or 3ly. The Authority of the present Church to make and declare new Articles of Faith. Or 4ly. The absolute necessity of such a change as this in the Sacrament to the comfort and benefit of those who receive this Sacrament. Or 5ly. To magnifie the power of the Priest in being able to work so great a Miracle.

1st. They pretend for this Doctrine the Authority of Scripture in those words of our Saviour, *This is my body*. Now to shew the insufficiency of this pretence, I shall endeavour to make good these

1. That there is no neceſſity of underſtanding thoſe words of our Saviour in the ſenſe of *Tranſubſtantiation*.

2. That there is a great deal of reaſon to underſtand them otherwiſe

Firſt, That there is no neceſſity to underſtand thoſe words of our Saviour in the ſenſe of *Tranſubſtantiation*. *If* there be any, it muſt be from one of theſe two reaſons. Either becauſe there are no figurative expreſſions in Scripture, which *I* think no man ever yet ſaid: or elſe, becauſe a Sacrament admits of no figures; which would be very abſurd for any man to ſay, ſince it is *of* the very nature *of* a *Sacrament* to repreſent and exhibit ſome inviſible grace and benefit by an outward ſign and figure: And eſpecially ſince it cannot be denyed, but that in the inſtitution *of* this very *Sacrament* our Saviour uſeth figurative expreſſions and ſeveral words which cannot be taken ſtrickly and literally. When he gave the *Cup*, he ſaid, *This Cup is the new Teſtament in my blood, which is ſhed for you, and for many, for the remiſſion of ſins.* Where firſt, the *Cup* is put for *Wine* contained in the Cup; or elſe if the words be literally taken, ſo as to ſignifie a ſubſtantial change, it is not of the *Wine* but of the *Cup*; and that, not into the *blood of Chriſt* but into the *new Teſtament* or *new Covenant* in his blood. Beſides, that his blood is ſaid *then* to be ſhed, and his body to be broken, which was not till his Paſſion, which followed the Inſtitution, and firſt celebration of this *Sacrament*.

But that there is no neceſſity to underſtand our Saviour's words in the ſenſe of *Tranſubſtantiation*, I will take the plain confeſſion of a great number of the moſt learned Writers of the Church of *Rome* in this Controverſie. (a) *Bellarmine*, (b) *Suarez* and (c) *Vaſquez* do acknowledge *Scotus* the great *Schoolman* to have ſaid that this Doctrine cannot be evidently proved from Scripture: And *Bellarmine* grants this not to be improbable; and *Suarez* and *Vaſquez* acknowledge (d) *Durandus* to have ſaid as much. (e) *Ocham*, another famous Schoolman, ſays expreſly, that *the Doctrine which holds the ſubſtance of the Bread and Wine to remain after conſecration is neither repugnant to Reaſon nor to Scripture.* (f) *Petrus ab Alliaco* Cardinal of *Cambray* ſays plainly, that *the Doctrine of the Subſtance of Bread and Wine remaining after Conſecration is more eaſie and free from abſurdity, more rational, and no ways repugnant to the authority of Scripture*; nay more, that for the other Doctrine, *viz.* of *Tranſubſtantiation*, *there is no evidence in Scripture.* (g) *Gabriel Biel*, another great Schoolman and Divine of their Church, freely declares, that *as to any thing expreſs'd in*

(a) *de Euch. l. 3. c. 23*
(b) *in 3. diſ. 49. Qu. 75. Sect. 2.*
(c) *in 3. part. diſp. 180. Qu. 75. art. 2 c. 15.*
(d) *in Sent. l. 4, diſt. 11. Qu: 1: n: 15:*
(e) *in 4: Sent. Q. 5. & Quod l. 4. Q. 3.*
(f) *in 4 Sent Q. 6. art 2.*
(g) *in canon. Miſſ. Lect. 40.*

ſtance of *Bread and Wine doth remain after Conſecration:* and therefore he reſolves the belief of *Tranſubſtantiation* into ſome other Revelation beſides Scripture, which he ſuppoſeth the Church had about it. Cardinal (h) *Cajetan* confeſſeth that *the Goſpel doth no where expreſs that the Bread is changed into the Body of Chriſt, that we have this from the authority of the Church:* nay, he goes farther, *that there is nothing in the Goſpel which enforceth any man to underſtand theſe words of Chriſt*, this is my body, *in a proper and not a metaphorical ſenſe; but the Church having underſtood them in a proper ſenſe they are to be ſo explained*; Which words in the *Roman* Edition of *Cajetan* are expunged by order of Pope (i) *Pius* V. Cardinal (k) *Contrareus*, and (l) *Melchior Canus* one of the beſt and moſt judicious Writers that Church ever had, reckon this *Doctrine* among thoſe *which are not ſo expreſſly found in Scripture.* I will add but one more; of great authority in the Church, and a reputed Martyr, (m) *Fiſher* Biſhop of *Rocheſter* who ingenuouſly confeſſeth that in the words of the *Inſtitution*, *there is not one word from whence the true preſence of the fleſh and bloud of Chriſt in in our Maſs can be proved:* So that we need not much contend that this *Doctrine* hath no certain foundation in Scripture, when this is ſo fully and frankly acknowledged by our Adverſaries themſelves.

(h) *in Aquin. 3. part. Qu. 75. art. 1.*

(i) *Ægid. Conink. de Sacram. Q. 75. art. 1. n. 13.* (k) *de Sacram. l. 2. c. 3.* (l) *Loc. Theolog. l. 3. c. 3.* (m) *contra captiv. Babylon. c, 10. n. 2.*

Secondly, If there be no neceſſity of underſtanding our Saviour's words in the ſenſe of *Tranſubſtantiation*, I am ſure there is a great deal of reaſon to underſtand them otherwiſe. Whether we conſider the the like expreſſions in Scripture; as where our Saviour ſays, he is *the door*, and *the true Vine* (which the Church of *Rome* would mightily have triumph'd in, had it been ſaid, *this is my true body.*) And ſo likewiſe where the Church is ſaid to be *Chriſts body*; and the *Rock* which followed the *Iſraelites* to be *Chriſt*, 1. *Cor.* 10. 4. *They drank of that rock which followed them*, and, *that rock was Chriſt:* All which and innumerable more like expreſſions in Scripture every man underſtands in a figurative, and not in a ſtrictly literal and abſurd ſenſe. And it is very well known, that in the *Hebrew* Language things are commonly ſaid to that which they do ſignify & repreſent; and there is not in that Language a more proper and uſual way of expreſſing a thing to ſignifie ſo and ſo, than to ſay that it is ſo and ſo. Thus *Joſeph* expounding *Pharaoh's* dream to him, *Gen.* 41. 26. Says, *the ſeven good kine are ſeven years*, and *the ſeven good ears of corn are ſeven years.* that is, they ſignified or repreſented ſeven years of plenty; and

ſtand the like expreſſions; nor do I believe that any ſenſible man, who had never heard of *Tranſubſtantiation* being grounded upon theſe words of our *Saviour*, *this is my body*, would upon reading the inſtitution of the Sacrament in the *Goſpel* ever have imagin'd any ſuch thing to be meant by our *Saviour* in thoſe words; but would have underſtood his meaning to have been, *this Bread* ſignifies my *Body*, this *Cup* ſignifies my *Bloud*; and this which you ſee me now do, do ye hereafter for a *Memorial of* Me: But ſurely it would never have enter'd into any man's mind to have thought that our *Saviour* did literally hold himſelf in his hand, and give away himſelf from himſelf with his own hands.

Or whether we compare theſe words of our *Saviour* with the ancient Form of the Paſſover uſed by the *Jews* from *Ezra's* time, as (*n*) *Juſtin Martyr* tells us, τοῦτο το πασχα ὁ σωτηρ ἡμῶν και ἡκαταφυγη ἡμῶν, *this Paſſover is our Saviour and our refuge:* not that they believed the Paſchal Lamb to be ſubſtantially changed either into God their *Saviour* who delivered them out of the *Land of Egypt*, or into the *Meſſias* the Saviour whom they expected and who was ſignified by it: But this Lamb which they did eat did repreſent to them and put them in mind of that *Salvation* which *God* wrought for their Fathers in *Egypt*, when by the ſlaying of a Lamb and ſprinkling the bloud of it upon their doors their firſt-born were paſſed over and ſpared; and did likewiſe foreſhew the Salvation of the *Meſſias*, *the Lamb of God that was to take away the Sins of the world.*

(*n*) *Dialog. cum* Tryph. *p.* 297. *Edit.* Pariſ. 1639.

And nothing is more common in all Languages than to give the name of the thing ſignified to the *Sign*. As the delivery of a Deed or Writting under-hand and ſeal is call'd a conveyance or making over of ſuch an Eſtate, and it is really ſo; not the delivery of meer wax and parchment, but the conveyance of a real Eſtate; as truly and and really to all effects and purpoſes of Law, as if the material houſes and lands themſelves could be and were actually delivered into my hands: In like manner the names of the things themſelves made over to us in the new Covenant of the Goſpel between GOD and Man, are given to the *Signs* or Seals of that Covenant. By *Baptiſm* Chriſtians are ſaid to be *made partakers of the Holy Ghoſt*, *Heb.* 6. 4. And by the Sacrament of the Lord's *Supper* we are ſaid to *communicate* or to be made *partakers of the Body of Chriſt which was broken, and of his Blood which was ſhed for us*, that is, of the real benefits of his death and Paſſion. And thus St. *Paul* ſpeaks of this *Sacrament*, 1 *Cor.* 10. 16. *The cup of bleſſing which we bleſs, is it not the communion of the blood of Chriſt?*

bread and one body; for we are partakers of that one bread. The Church of *Rome* might, if they pleased, as well argue from hence that all Christians are substantially changed first into Bread, and then into the natural Body of Christ by their participation of the *Sacrament*, because they are said thereby to be *one bread* and *one body*. And the same Apostle in the next *Chapter*, after he had spoken of the consecration of the Elements still calls them the *bread and the cup*, in three *verses* together, *As often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup*, v. 26. *Whosoever shall eat this bread and drink this cup of the Lord unworthily*, v. 27. *But let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of this bread and drink of that cup*, v. 28. And our *Saviour* himself when he had said, *this is my blood of the new Testament*, immediately adds, * *but I say unto you, I will not henceforth drink of this fruit of the Vine, untill I drink it new with you in my Father's Kingdom*, that is, not till after his resurrection, which was the first step of his exaltation into the Kingdom given him by his Father, when the *Scripture* tells us he did eat and drink with his *Disciples*. But that which I observe from our Saviour's words is, that after the consecration of the *cup* and the delivering of it to his Disciples to drink of it, he tells them that he would thenceforth drink no more of the fruit of the Vine, which he had now drank with them, till after his Resurrection. From whence it is plain that was the fruit of the Vine, real wine, which our *Saviour* drank of and communicated to his *Disciples* in the *Sacrament*.

*Matth. 26, 29.

Besides, if we consider that he celebrated this Sacrament before his *Passion*, it is impossible these words should be understood literally of *the natural body and blood of Christ*; because it was *his body broken* and *his blood shed* which he gave to his Disciples, which if we understand literally of his natural body broken & his blood shed, then these words, *this is my body which is broken, and this is my blood which is shed*, could not be true, because his Body was then whole and unbroken, and his blood not then shed; nor could it be a *propitiatory Sacrifice* (as they affirm this Sacrament to be) unless they will say that propitiation was made before Christ suffer'd: And it is likewise impossible that the Disciples should understand these words literally, because they not only plainly saw that what he gave them was *Bread* and *Wine*, but they saw likewise as plainly that it was not his Body which was given, but his Body which gave that which was given; not his Body *broken* and his blood *shed*, because they saw him alive at that very time and beheld his body whole and unpeirc'd; and therefore they could not understand these words literally: If they did, can we imagine that the Disciples, who upon all other occasions were so full of questions and

tell him, we ſee this to be Bread and that to be Wine, and we ſee thy Body to be diſtinct from both; we ſee thy Body not broken, and thy Blood not ſhed.

From all which it muſt needs be very evident, to any man that will impartially conſider things, how little reaſon there is to underſtand thoſe words of our Saviour, *this is my body*, and *this is my blood*, in the ſenſe of *Tranſubſtantiation*; nay on the contrary, that there is very great reaſon and an evident neceſſity to underſtand them otherwiſe. I proceed to ſhew,

2*ly*. That this Doctrine is not grounded upon the *perpetual belief of the Chriſtian Church*, which the Church of *Rome* vainly pretends as an evidence that the Church did alwayes underſtand and interpret our Saviour's words in this ſenſe.

To manifeſt the groundleſneſs of this pretence, I ſhall, 1. ſhew by plain teſtimony of the *Fathers* in ſeveral Ages, that this Doctrine was not the belief of the ancient Chriſtian Church. 2. I ſhall ſhew the time and occaſion of its coming in, and by what degrees it grew up and was eſtabliſhed in the *Roman* Church. 3. I ſhall anſwer their great pretended Demonſtration that this always was and muſt have been the conſtant belief of the Chriſtian Church.

1. I ſhall ſhew by plain Teſtimonies of the *Fathers* in ſeveral Ages, for above five hundred years after Chriſt, that this Doctrine was not the *belief of the ancient Chriſtian Church*. I deny not but that the *Fathers* do, and that with great reaſon, very much magnify the wonderful miſtery and efficacy of this Sacrament, and frequently ſpeak of a great Supernatural change made by the divine benediction; which we alſo readily acknowledge. They ſay indeed, that the Elements of Bread and Wine do by the divine bleſſing become to us the Body and Blood of Chriſt: But they likewiſe ſay that the names of the things ſignified are given to the Signs; that the Bread and Wine do ſtill remain in their proper nature and ſubſtance, and that they are turn'd into the ſubſtance of our Bodies; that the Body of Chriſt in the Sacrament is not his natural Body, but the ſign and figure of it; not that Body which was crucified, nor that Bloud which was ſhed upon the Croſs; and that it is impious to underſtand the *eating of the fleſh of the Son of man, and drinking his blood* literally: all which are directly oppoſite to the Doctrine of *Tranſubſtantiation* and utterly inconſiſtent with it. I will ſelect but ſome few Teſtimonies of many which I might bring to this purpoſe.

I begin with *Juſtin Martyr*, who ſays expreſly, that * *our blood and fleſh are nouriſhed by the converſion of that food which we receive in the Euchariſt*: But that cannot be the natural body and blood of Chriſt, for no man will ſay that is con-

* *Apol.* 2. *p.* 98. Edit. Pariſ. 1636.

verted into the nouriſhment of our bodies.

† Lib. 4. c. 34. The Second is * *Irenæus*: who ſpeaking of this Sacrament, ſays, that the *bread which is from the earth receiving the divine invocation is now no longer common bread but the Euchariſt* (or Sacrament) *conſiſting of two things, the one earthly, the other heavenly.* He ſays it is no longer common bread, but after invocation or conſecration it becomes the Sacrament, that is, bread ſanctified, conſiſting of two things an earthly and a heavenly; the earthly thing is bread, and the heavenly is the divine bleſſing which by the invocation or conſecration is added to it. And † elſewere he hath this paſſage, *When therefore the cup that is mixed* (that is, of Wine and Water) *and the bread that is broken receives the word of God, it becomes the Euchariſt of the blood and body of Chriſt, of which the ſubſtance of our fleſh is increaſed and conſiſts*; but if that which we received in the Sacrament do nouriſh our bodies, it muſt be bread and wine, & not the natural body and blood of Chriſt. There is another remarkable Teſtimony of *Irenæus*, which though it be not now extent in thoſe *works* of his which remain, yet hath been preſerved by *Oecumenius*, and it is this, when (ſays he) *the Greeks had taken ſome Servants, of the Chriſtian Catechumeni* (that is, ſuch as had not been admitted to the Sacrament) *and afterwards urged them by violence to tell them ſome of the ſecrets of the Chriſtians, theſe Servants having nothing to ſay that might gratify thoſe who offered violence to them, except only that they had heard from their Maſters that the divine Communion was the blood and body of Chriſt, they thinking that it was really blood and fleſh, declared as much to thoſe that queſtioned them. The Greeks taking this as if it were really done by the Chriſtians, diſcovered it to others of the Greeks; who hereupon put* Sanctus *and* Blandina *to the torture to make them confeſs it. To whom* Blandina *boldly anſwered, How would they endure to do this, who by way of exerciſe* (or abſtinence) *do not eat that fleſh which may lawfully be eaten?* By which it appears that this which they would have charg'd upon *Chriſtians*, as if they had literally eaten the fleſh and bloud of Chriſt in the Sacrament, was a falſe accuſation which theſe Martyrs denied, ſaying they were ſo far from that, that they for their part did not eat any fleſh at all.

* lib. 5. c. 2.

* Comment: in 1 Pet. c: 3:

The next is *Tertullian*, who proves againſt *Marcion* the Heretique that the Body of our Saviour was not a mere phantaſm and appearance, but a real Body, becauſe the Sacrament is a figure and image of his Body; and if there be an image of his body he muſt have a real body, otherwiſe the Sacrament would be an image of an image. His words are theſe, * *the bread which our Saviour took and diſtributed to his Diſciples he made his own body, ſaying this is*

* Adverſ. Marcionem

who denied the certainty of ſenſe he uſeth this Argument; That if we queſtion our ſenſes we may doubt whether our Bleſſed Saviour were not deceived in what he heard, and ſaw; and and touched. * *He might* (ſays he) *be deceived in the voice from heaven, in the ſmell of the ointment with which he was anointed againſt his burial; and in the taſte of the wine which he conſecrated in rememberance of his bloud.* So that it ſeems we are to truſt our ſenſes, even in the matter of the Sacrament; and if that be true, the Doctrine of *Tranſubſtantiation* is certainly falſe.

* *Lib. de Anima. p.* 319.

Origen in his * Comment on *Matth.* 15, ſpeaking of the Sacrament hath this paſſage, *That food which is ſanctified by the word of God and prayer; as to that of it which is material, goeth into the belly and is caſt out into the draught,* which none ſurely will ſay of the Body of Chriſt. And afterwards he adds by way of explication, *it is not the matter of the bread, but the word which is ſpoken over it, which profiteth him that worthily eateth the Lord; and this* (he ſays) *he hath ſpoken concerning the typical and Symbolical body.* So that the matter of bread remaineth in the Sacrament, and this *Origen* calls the *typical and Symbolical* body of Chriſt; and it is not the natural body of Chriſt which is there eaten, for the food eaten in the Sacrament, as to that of it which is material, goeth into the belly and is caſt out into the draught. This teſtimony is ſo very plain in the Cauſe, that *Sextus Senenſis* ſuſpects this place of *Origen* was depraved by the Heretiques. *Cardinal Perron* is contented to allow it to be *Origen's*, but rejects his teſtimony becauſe he was accuſed of *Hereſie* by ſome of the Fathers, and ſays he talks like a Heretique in this place. So that with much ado this teſtimony is yielded to us. The ſame *Father* in his * *Homilies* upon *Leviticus* ſpeaks thus, *There is alſo in the New Teſtament a letter which kills him who doth not Spiritually underſtand thoſe things which are ſaid; for if we take according to the Letter that which is ſaid,* EXCEPT YE EAT MY FLESH AND DRINK MY BLOUD, *this Letter kills.* And this alſo is a killing Teſtimony; and not to be anſwered but in Cardinal *Perrons* way, by ſaying *he talks like a Heretique.*

* *Edit. Huetii.*

‡ *Cap.* 10.

St. Cyprain hath a whole Epiſtle * to *Cecilius*, againſt thoſe who gave the Communion in Water only without Wine mingled with it; and his main argument againſt them is this, that *the bloud of Chriſt with which we are redeemed and quickened cannot ſeem to be the cup when there is no Wine in the cup by which the Bloud of Chriſt is repreſented:* and afterwards he ſays, that *contrary to the Evangelical and Apoſtolical* Doctrine *water was in ſome places offered* (or given) *in the Lord's Cup, which* (ſays he) *alone cannot ex-*

* *Ep.* 63.

preſs (or repreſent) *the blood of Chriſt.* And laſtly he tells us, that *by water* the people is underſtood, *by Wine the blood of Chriſt is ſhewn* (or repreſented) *but when in the Cup water is mingled with Wine, the people is united to Chriſt.* So that according to this Argument *Wine* in the *Sacramental cup* is no otherwiſe chang'd into the *blood of Chriſt than the Water* mixed with it is changed into the *People*, which are ſaid to be *united to Chriſt.*

I omit many others, and paſs to St. *Auſtin* in the *fourth Age* after Chriſt. And I the rather inſiſt upon his Teſtimony, becauſe of his eminent eſteem and authority in the *Latine* Church; and he alſo calls the *Elements* of the *Sacrament* the *figure and Sign of Chriſts body and blood.* In this Book againſt *Adimantus* the *Manichee*, we have this expreſſion, * *our Lord did not doubt to ſay, this is my Body, when he gave the Sign of his Body.* And in his explication of the third *Pſalm*, ſpeaking of *Judas* whom our Lord admitted to his laſt *Supper*, *in which* (ſays he) * *he commanded and delivered to his Diſciples the figure of his Body*; Language which would now be cenſured for Hereſies in the Church of *Rome.* Indeed he was never *accus'd of Hereſie*, as Cardinal *Perron* ſays *Origen* was, but *he talks as like* one as *Origen* himſelf. And in his *Comment* on the 98 *Pſalm*, ſpeaking of the offence which the Diſciples took at that ſaying of our *Saviour*, *except ye eat the fleſh of the Son of man and drink his blood, &c.* he brings in our *Saviour* ſpeaking thus to them, * *ye muſt underſtand Spiritually what I have ſaid unto you; ye are not to eat this body which ye ſee, and to drink that blood which ſhall be ſhed by thoſe that ſhall crucifie me. I have commended a certain Sacrament to you, which being Spiritually underſtood will give you life.* What more oppoſite to the Doctrine of *Tranſubſtantiation*, then that the *Diſciples* were not to eat that Body of Chriſt which they ſaw, nor to drink that blood which was ſhed upon the Croſs, but that all this was to be underſtood ſpiritually and according to the nature of a *Sacrament?* For that body he tells us is not here but in heaven, in his Comment upon theſe words, *me ye have not always.* * *He ſpeaks* (ſays he) *of the preſence of his body; ye ſhall have me according to my providence, according to Majeſty and inviſible grace; but according to the fleſh which the word aſſumed, according to that which was born of the Virgin* Mary, *ye ſhall not have me: therefore becauſe he converſed with his Diſciples fourty dayes, he is aſcended up into heaven and is not here.*

*Aug. Tom. 6. p. 187. Edit. Baſil. 1569.

*Enarrat in Pſal. Tom. 8. p. 16.

*Id Tom. 9: p. 1165.

*Id Tract. 50: in Johan.

In his 23d. Epiſtle; * *If the Sacraments* (ſays he) *had not ſome reſemblance of thoſe things whereof they are Sacraments, they would not be Sacraments at all; but from this re-*

*Id Tom. 2. p. 93

ſemblance they take for the moſt part the names of the things which they repreſent. Therefore as the Sacrament of the body of Chriſt is in ſome manner or ſenſe Chriſt's body; and the Sacrament of his blood is the blood of Chriſt; So the Sacrament of faith (meaning *Baptiſm*) *is faith.* Upon which words of St. *Auſtin* there is this remarkable *Gloſs* in their own *Canon Law*; ‖ *the heavenly Sacrament which truly repreſents the fleſh of Chriſt is called the body of Chriſt; but improperly: whence it is ſaid, that after a manner, but not according to the truth of the thing, but the myſtrie of the thing ſignified; So that the meaning is, it is called the body of Chriſt, that is, it ſignifies the body of Chriſt:* And if this be St. *Auſtin's* meaning, I am ſure no *Proteſtant* can ſpeak more plainly againſt *Tranſubſtantiation.* And in the ancient *Canon* of the *Maſs*, before it was changed in complyance with this new Doctrine, it is expreſly called *a Sacrament, a Sign, an Image, and a figure of Chriſt's body.* To which I will add that remarkable paſſage of St. *Auſtin* cited by * *Gratian*, *that as we receive the ſimilitude of his death in Baptiſm, ſo we may alſo receive the likeneſs of his fleſh and blood; that ſo neither may truth be wanting in the Sacrament, nor* Pagans *have occaſion to make us ridiculous for drinking the blood of one that was ſlain.*

‡ *De Conſecrat. diſt 2. Hoceſt*

* *De Conſecrat: diſt. 2 Sect. Verum.*

I will mention but one Teſtimony more of this *Father*, but ſo clear an one as it is impoſſible any man in his wits that had believed *Tranſubſtantiation* could have utter'd. *It* is in his *Treatiſe* **de Doctrina Chriſtiana*; where laying down ſeveral Rules for the right underſtanding of Scripture, he gives this for one. *If* (ſays he) *the ſpeech be a precept forbidding ſome heinous wickedneſs or crime, or commanding us to do good, it is not figurative; but if it ſeem to command any heinous wickedneſs or crime, or to forbid that which is profitable and beneficial to others, it is figurative. For example, Except ye eat the fleſh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you? This ſeems to command a heinous wickedneſs and crime, therefore it is a figure; commanding us to communicate of the paſſion of our Lord, and with advantage to lay up in our memory that his fleſh was crucified and wounded for us.* So that accotding to St. *Auſtin's* beſt skill in interpreting Scripture, the *literal eating* of the fleſh of Chriſt, and drinking his blood would have been a great impiety; and therefore the expreſſion is to be underſtood figuratively; and not as Cardinal *Perron* would have it, only in oppoſition to the eating of his fleſh and blood in the groſs appearance of fleſh and blood, but to the real eating of his natural body and blood under any appearance whatſoever: For St. *Auſtin* doth not ſay, this is a Figurative ſpeech wherein we are commanded really to feed upon the natural body and blood of Chriſt under the *ſpecies* of bread and wine, as the Cardinal would underſtand him; for then the ſpeech would be literal and not figurative: But he ſays, this is a figurative ſpeech wherein we are commanded Spiritually to feed upon

* *Lib. 3: Tom: 3. pag. 53.*

To these I will add but *three* or *four* Testimonies more in the *two* following Ages.

The first shall be of *Theodoret*, who speaking of that * Prophesie of *Jacob* concerning our Saviour, *he washed his garments in Wine, and his cloaths in the bloud of grapes*, † hath these words, ‖ *as we call the mystical fruit of the Vine*, (that is, the Wine in the Sacrament) *after consecration the bloud of the Lord, so he* (*viz.* Jacob) *calls the bloud of the true Vine* (viz. of Christ) *the bloud of the grape*: but the bloud of Christ is not literally and properly but onely figuratively the bloud of the grape, in the same sense as he is said to be the true Vine; and therefore the Wine in the Sacrament after consecration is in like manner not literally and properly but figuratively the bloud of Christ. And he explains this afterwards, saying, that *our Saviour changed the names, and gave to his Body the name of the Symbol or Sign, and to the Symbol or Sign the name of his Body: thus when he had called himself the Vine, he called the Symbol or Sign his Bloud*; so that in the same sense that he called himself the Vine, he call'd the Wine, which is the Symbol of his Bloud, his Bloud: *For*, saies he, *he would have those who partake of the Divine Mysteries not to attend to the nature of the things which are seen, but by the change of names to believe the change which is made by Grace; for he who called that which by Nature is a Body Wheat and Bread, and again likewise called himself the Vine, he honoured the Symbols with the name of his Body and Bloud: not changing Nature but adding Grace to Nature.* Where you see he says expressly, that when he called the Symbols or Elements of the Sacrament, viz. *Bread and Wine his Body and Bloud*, he made no change in the nature of the things, only added Grace to Nature, that is, by the Divine Grace and Blessing he raised them to a Spiritual and Supernatural virtue and efficacy.

* Gen. 49. 11.

† Dialog. 1.

The *Second* is of the same *Theodoret* in his second Dialogue between a *Catholique*, under the name of *Orthodoxus*, and an *Heretique* under the name of *Eranistes*; who maintaining that the Humanity of Christ was chang'd into the substance of the Divinity (which was the Heresie of *Eutyches*) he illustrates the matter by this Similitude, *As*, says he, *the Symbols of the Lord's body and bloud are one thing before the invocation of the Priest, but after the invocation are changed and become another thing; So the body of our Lord after this ascension is changed into the divine substance.* But what says the Catholique *Orthodoxus* to this? why, he talks just like one of Cardinal *Perron's* Heretiques, Thou art says he, *caught in thy own net: because the mystical Symbols after consecration do not pass out of their own nature? for they remain in their former substance, figure, and appearance, and may be seen and handled even as before.* He does not only deny the outward figure and appearance of the Symbols to

proper and ſtricteſt ſenſe of the word ſubſtance? and it was neceſſary ſo to do, otherwiſe he had not given a pertinent anſwer to the ſimilitude urg'd againſt him.

The next is one of their own Popes, *Gelaſius*, who brings the ſame Inſtance againſt the *Eutychians*; * ſurely, ſays he, *the Sacraments which we receive of the body and bloud of our Lord are a divine thing, ſo that by them we are made partakers of a divine nature, and yet it ceaſeth not to be the ſubſtance or nature of bread and Wine; and certainly the image and reſemblance of Chriſts body and bloud are celebrated in the action of the myſteries*, that is, in the Sacrament. To make this Inſtance of any force againſt the *Eutychians*; who held that the body of Chriſt upon his aſcenſion ceaſ'd and was chang'd into the ſubſtance of his Divinity, it was neceſſary to deny that there was any ſubſtantial change in the Sacrament of the bread and wine into the body and bloud of Chriſt. So that here is an infallible authority, one of their own Popes expreſly againſt *Tranſubſtantiation*.

* Biblioth. Patr. Tom. 4.

The laſt Teſtimony *I* ſhall produce is of *Facundus* an *African* Biſhop, who lived in the 6th. Century. Upon occaſion of juſtifying an expreſſion of one who had ſaid that *Chriſt alſo received the adoption of Sons*, he reaſons thus. * *Chriſt vouchſafed to receive the Sacrament of adoption both when he was circumciſed and baptized: And the Sacrament of Adoption may be called adoption, as the Sacrament of his body and bloud, which is in the conſecrated bread and cup; is by us called his body and bloud: not that the bread, ſays he, is properly his body, and the cup his bloud, but becauſe they contain in them the myſteries of his body and bloud; hence alſo our Lord himſelf called the bleſſed bread and cup which he gave to his Diſciples, his body and bloud.* Can any man after this believe, that it was then, and had ever been, the univerſal and received Doctrine of the Chriſtian Church, that the bread and wine in the Sacrament are ſubſtantially changed into the proper and natural body and bloud of Chriſt?

* Facund. p. 144. edit. Pariſ. 1676.

By theſe plain Teſtimonies which I have produced, and I might have brought a great many more to the ſame purpoſe, it is *I* think evident beyond all denial that *Tranſubſtantiation* hath not been *the perpetual belief of the Chriſtian Church*. And this likewiſe is acknowledged by many great and learned men of the *Roman church*.

(a) *Scotus* acknowledgeth, that this Doctrine was not always thought neceſſary to be believed, but that the neceſſity of believing it was conſequent to that Declaration of the Church made in the Council of *Lateran* under Pope *Innocent* the III. And (b) *Durandus* freely diſcovers

(a) *In Sent. l.* 4 *Diſt.* 11. Q 3.

(b) *in Sent. l.* 3.

had not by that determination obliged men to believe it, (c) Tonſtal Biſhop of *Durham* alſo yields, that *before the Lateran Council men were at liberty as to the manner of Chriſts preſence in the Sacrament.* And (d) *Eraſmus*, who lived and died in the communion of the *Roman* Church, and than whom no man was better read in the ancient *Fathers*, doth confeſs that it *was late before the Church defined Tranſubſtantiation, unknown to the Ancients both name and thing.* And (e) *Alphonſus a Caſtro* ſays plainly, that *concerning the Tranſubſtantiation of the bread into the Body of Chriſt, there is ſeldom any mention in the Ancient Writers.* And who can imagine that theſe learned men would have granted the ancient *Church* and Fathers to have been ſo much Strangers to this Doctrine, had they thought it to have been the perpetual belief of the Church? I ſhall now in the

(c) *de Euchar l. 1. p:* 146.

(d) *in. 1. Epiſt ad Corin. c. 7. citante etiam* Salmerone, *Tom. 9. Tract. 16. p. 108.*

(e) *De Hæreſ. l. 8.*

Second place, give an account of the *particular time and occaſion of the coming in of this Doctrine*, and by what ſteps and degrees it grew up and was advanced into an Article of Faith in the *Romiſh Church*. The Doctrine of the *Corporal preſence of Chriſt* was firſt ſtarted upon occaſion of the Diſpute about the *Worſhip of Images*, in oppoſition whereto the *Synod of Conſtantinople* about the year *DCCL* did argue thus, That our LORD having left us no other Image of himſelf but the Sacrament, in which the ſubſtance of bread is the Image of his Body, we ought to make no other Image of our LORD. In anſwer to this Argument, the ſecond *Council of Nice* in the year DCCLXXXVII did declare, that the Sacrament after Conſecration *is not the image and antitype* of Chriſts Body and Bloud, but is properly his Body and Bloud. So that the *corporal Body of Chriſt in the Sacrament* was brought in *to ſupport the ſtupid worſhip of Images:* And indeed it could never have come in upon a more proper occaſion, nor have been applyed to a fitter purpoſe.

And here I cannot but take notice how well this agrees with * *Bellarmine's* Obſervation, that none *of the Ancients who wrote Hereſies, hath put this errour* (viz. of denying Tranſubſtantiation *in his catalogue; nor did any of the Ancients diſpute againſt this errour for the firſt 600. years.* Which is very true, becauſe then there could be no occaſion then to diſpute againſt thoſe who denyed *Tranſubſtantiation*; ſince, as I have ſhewn, this Doctrine was not in being, unleſs among the *Eutychian* Heretiques, for the firſt 600 years and more. But * *Bellarmine* goes on and tells us, that the firſt *who called in queſtion the truth of the Body of the LORD in the Euchariſt were the* Iconomachi (the oppo-

‡ De Euchariſt. *lib. 1. cap. 1.*

* *Ibid.*

for these said there was one image of Christ instituted by Christ himself, VIZ. *the bread and wine in the Eucharist, which represents the body and bloud of Christ: Wherefore from that time the Greek Writers often admonish us that the Eucharist is not the figure or image of the body of the Lord, but his true body, as appears from the* VII. *Synod*; which agrees most exactly with the account which I have given of the first rise of this *Doctrine*, which began with the *corporal presence of Christ* in the Sacrament, and afterwards proceeded to *Transubstantiation*.

And as this was the first occasion of introducing this *Doctrine* among the *Greeks*, so in the *Latine* or *Roman* Church *Paschasius Radbertus*, first a *Monk*, and afterwards *Abbat* of *Corbey*, was the first broacher of it in the year DCCCXVIII.

And for this, besides the Evidence of History, we have the acknowledgement of two very Eminent Persons in the *Church of Rome*, *Bellarmine* and *Sirmondus*, who do in effect confess, that this *Paschasius* was the first who wrote to purpose upon this Argument. *De Scrip. Ecc.

* *Bellarmine* in these words, *This Author was the first who hath seriously and copiously written concerning the truth of Christs Body and Bloud in the Eucharist*: And *Sirmondus* in these, *he so first explained the genuine sense of the Catolique Church*, *that he opened the way to the rest who afterwards in great numbers wrote upon the same Argument*: But though *Sirmondus* is pleased to say, that he only first explained the sense of the Catholique Church in this point, yet it is very plain from the Records of that Age which are left to us, that this was the first time that this *Doctrine* broached in the *Latine Church*; & it met with great opposition in that Age, as I shall have occasion hereafter to shew. For *Rabanus Maurus* Arch-bishop of *Mentz* about the year 847 reciting the very words of *Paschasius* wherein he delivered this *Doctrine*, hath this remarkable passage concerning the novelty of it; * *Some*, says he, *of late, not having a right opinion concerning the Sacrament of the Body and Bloud of our LORD, have said that this the Body and Bloud of our LORD which was born of the Virgin* Mary, *and in which our LORD suffered upon the Cross, and rose from the Dead; which errour*, says he, *we have oppos'd with all our might*. From whence it is plain, by the Testimony of one of the greatest & most learned Bishops of that Age, & of eminent Reputation for Piety, that what is now the very Doctrine of the Church of *Rome* concerning the Sacrament, was then esteemed an errour broached by some particular Persons, but was far from being the generally receiv'd Doctrine of that Age. Can any one think it possible, that so eminent a Person in the Church both for Piety and Learning, could have condemned this Doctrine as an Errour and a Novelty, had it been the general Doctrine of the Christian Church, not only in that but

* *Epist. ad Heribaldum, c. 31.*

in all former Ages; and no censure pass'd upon him for that which is now the *great Burning Article* in the Church of *Rome*, and esteemed by them one of the greatest and most pernicious Heresies?

Afterwards in the year 1059, when *Berengarius* in *France* and *Germany* had rais'd a fresh opposition against this Doctrine, he was compelled to recant it by Pope *Nicholas* and the *council at Rome*, in these words, *that* * *the bread and wine which are set upon the Altar, after the consecration are not only the Sacrament, but the true Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ; and are sensibly, not only the Sacrament but in truth, handled and broken by the hands of the Priest, and ground or bruised by the teeth of the Faithful.* But it seems the Pope and his Council were not then skilfull enough to express themselves rightly in this matter; for the *Gloss* upon the *Canon Law* says expresly, * *that unless we understand these words of* BERENGARIUS (*that is in truth of the Pope and his Council*) *in a sound sense: we shall fall into a greater Heresie than that of* BERENGARIUS; *for we do not make parts of the body of Christ.* The meaning of which *Gloss* I cannot imagine, unless it be this, that the *Body of Christ*, though it be in truth *broken*, yet it is not *broken into parts* (*for we do not make parts of the body of Christ*,) but into *wholes*: Now this new way of *breaking a Body*, not into *parts* but into *wholes* (which in good earnest is the Doctrine of the Church of *Rome*) though to them that are able to believe *Transubstantiation* it may for any thing I know appear to be *sound sense*, yet to us that cannot believe, so it appears to be *solid non-sense*.

* Gratian. de consecrat. distinct. 2. Lanfranc. de corp. & sang. Dom. c. 5. Guitmund de Sacram. l. 1 Alger. de [illegible] cramel. l. 1. c. 1

* Gloss. Decret. de consecrat. dist. 2. in cap. Ego Berengarius.

About 20 years after, in the year 1529 Pope *Gregory* the 7th. began to be sensible of this absurdity; and therefore in another *Council* at *Rome* made *Berengarius* to recant in another *Form*, viz. * *that the bread and Wine which are placed upon the Alter are substantially changed into the true and proper and quickning flesh and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was born of the Virgin, and which being offered for the Salvation of the World did hang upon the Cross, and sits on the right hand of the Father.*

* Waldens. Tom. 2. c. 13.

So that from the first starting of this Doctrine in the *second Council of Nice* in the year 787 till the Council under *Pope Gregory* the 7th. In the year 1079, it was almost three hundred years that this Doctrine was contested, and before this mishapen *Monster of Transubstantiation could be lick'd* into that Form in which it is now setled and established in the Church of *Rome*. Here then is a plain account of the first rise of his Doctrine, and of the several steps whereby it was advanced by the Church of *Rome* into an *Article of Faith*. I come now in the

possibility that this Doctrine, if it had been new, should ever have come in, in any Age, and been received in the Church; and consequently it must of necessity have been the perpetual belief of the Church in all Ages. For if it had not always been the Doctrine of the Church, whenever it had attempted first to come in, there would have been a great stir and bustle about it, and the whole Christian World would have rose up in opposition to it. But we can shew no such time when first it came in, and when any such opposition was made to it, and therefore it was always the Doctrine of the Church. This *Demonstration Monsieur Arnauld*, a very learned Man in *France*, pretends to be unanswerable, whether it be so or not I shall briefly examine. And

First, we do assign a punctual and very likely time of the first rise of this Doctrine, about the beginning of the 9 *Age*; though it did not take firm root nor was fully setled and established till towards the end of the 11th. And this was the most likely time of all other, from the beginning of Christianity, for so gross an Errour to appear; it being by the confession and consent of their Historians, the most dark and dismal time that ever happened to the Christian Church both for *Ignorance* and *Superstition*, and *Vice*. It came in together with *Idolatry*, and was made use of to support it: A fit prop and companion for it. And indeed what tares might not the Enemy have *sown* in so dark and long a *Night*; when so considerable a part of the Christian World was lull'd asleep in profound Ignorance and Superstition; And this agrees very well with the account which our *Saviour* himself gives in the *Parable* of the *Tares*, of the Springing up of Errours and corruptions in the Field of the Church. **While the men slept* the Enemy did his work in the Night, so that when they were awake they wondered how and whence the tares came; but being sure they were there, and that they were not sown at first, they concluded *the Enemy had done it.*

* Matth. 13. 25.

Secondly, I have shewn likewise that there was *considerable opposition* made to this Errour at its first coming in. The general Ignorance and gross Superstition of that Age rendered the generality of people more quiet and secure, and disposeth them to receive any thing that came under a pretence of mystery in *Religion and of greater reverence and devotion of the Sacrament*, and that seemed any way to countenance the worship of *Images*, for which at that time they were zealously concern'd. But notwithstanding the security and passive temper of the People, the men most eminent for Piety and Learning in that Time made great resistance against it. I have already named *Rabanus* Arch-Bishop of *Mentz*, who oppos'd it as an Errour lately [illegible] but upon some few persons.

tus Erigena, and *Ratramnus* commonly known by the name of *Bertram* who at the same time were employed by the Emperour *Charles* the *Bald* to oppose this growing Errour, and wrote learnedly against it. And these were the eminent men for learning in that time. And because Monsieur *Arnauld* will not be satisfied unless there were some stir and bustle about it, *Bertram* in his *Preface* to his Book tells us, that they *who according to their several opinions talked differently about the mystery of Christ's body and bloud were divided by no small Schism.*

Thirdly, Though for a more clear and satisfactory answer to this pretended *Demonstration* I have been contented to untye this knot, yet I could without all these pains have cut it. For suppose this Doctrine had silently come in and without opposition, so that we could not assign the particular time and occasion of its first Rise; yet if it be evident from the Records of former Ages, for above D. years together that this was not the ancient belief of the Church, and plain also, that this *Doctrine* was afterwards received in the *Roman* Church, though we could not tell how and when it came in, yet it would be the wildest and most extravagant thing in the world to set up a pretended Demonstration of Reason against plain Experience and matter of *Fact*. This is just *Zenos* Demonstration of the impossibility of motion against *Diogenes* walking before his Eyes. For this is to undertake to prove that impossible to have been, which most certainly was. Just thus the *Servants* in the *Parable* might have demonstrated that the *tares* were *wheat*, because they were sure none but good seed was sown at first, and no man could give any account of the punctual time when any *tares* were sown, or by whom; and if an Enemy had come to do it, he must needs have met with great resistance and opposition; but no such resistance was made, and therefore there could be no *tares* in the *field*, but that which they call'd *tares* was certainly *good wheat*. At the same rate a man might demonstrate that *our King*, his *Majesty of Britain*, is not return'd into *England*, nor restor'd to his Crown; because there being so great and powerfull an Army possess'd of his Lands, and therefore obliged by interest to keep him out, it was impossible He should ever come in without a great deal of fighting and bloud-shed: but there was no such thing, therefore he is not return'd and restor'd to his Crown. And by the like kind of Demonstration one might prove that the *Turk* did not invade *Christendom* last year, and besiege *Vienna*, because if he had, the most *Christian King*, who had the greatest Army in *Christendom* in readiness, would certainly have employed it against him; but Monsieur *Arnauld* certainly knows, no such thing was done. And therefore according to his way of Demonstration, the *matter of fact*, so commonly reported and believed, concerning the *Turks invasion of Christendom* and *besieging Vienna* last year, was a perfect mistake

But a man may demonſtrate till his head and heart ake, before he ſhall ever be able to prove that which certainly is, or was never to have been. For of all ſorts of impoſſibles nothing is more evidently ſo, than to make that which hath been not to have been. All the reaſon in the world is too weak to cope with ſo tough and obſtinate a difficulty. And I have often wondered how a man of Monſieur *Arnauld's* great wit and ſharp Judgment could prevail with himſelf to engage in ſo bad and baffled a Cauſe? or could think to defend it with ſo *wooden a Dagger* as his *Demonſtration* of *Reaſon* againſt certain *Experience* and *matter of Fact*: A thing if it be poſſible of equal abſurdity with what he pretends to demonſtrate, *Tranſubſtantiation* it ſelf. I proceed to the

Third Pretended Ground of this Doctrine of *Tranſubſtantiation*; and that is, *The Infallible Authority of the preſent Church to make and declare new Articles of Faith.* And this in truth is the ground into which the moſt of the learned men of their Church did heretofore, and many do ſtill reſolve their belief of this Doctrine: And, as I have already ſhewn, do plainly ſay that they ſee no ſufficient reaſon either from *Scripture* or *Tradition* for the belief of it; And that they ſhould have believed the contrary had not the determination of the Church obliged them otherwiſe.

But if this Doctrine be obtruded upon the world meerly by virtue of the Authority of the *Roman Church*, and the Declaration of the *Council* under Pope *Gregory* the 7th. or of the *Lateran Council* under *Innocent* the 3d. Then it is a plain *Innovation* in the Chriſtian Doctrine, and a new *Article* of Faith impos'd upon the Chriſtian world. And if any Church hath this power, the Chriſtian *Faith* my be enlarged and changed as often as men pleaſe; and that which is no part of our Saviours *Doctrine*, nay, any thing though never ſo abſurd and unreaſonable, may become an *Article* of Faith obliging all Chriſtians to the belief of it, whenever the Church of *Rome* ſhal think fit to ſtamp her Authority upon it: which would make Chriſtianity a moſt uncertain and endleſs thing.

The *Fourth* pretended ground of this Doctrine is, *the neceſſity of ſuch a change as this in the Sacrament to the comfort and benefit of thoſe who receive it.* But there is no colour for this, if the thing be rightly conſider'd: Becauſe the comfort and benefit of the Sacrament depends upon the bleſſing annexed to the *Inſtitution*. And as *Water* in *Baptiſm*, without any ſubſtantial change made in that Element may by the Divine bleſſing accompanying the Inſtitution be effectual to the waſhing away of *Sin*, and *Spiritual* Regeneration; ſo there can no reaſon in the World be given why the *Elements* of *Bread* and *Wine* in the *Lord's Supper* may not, by the ſame Divine

blessing accompanying this Institution, make the worthy receivers partakers of all the Spiritual comfort and benefit designed to us thereby, without any substantial change made in those Elements, since our Lord hath told us, that *verily the flesh profiteth nothing.* So that if we could do so odd and strange a thing as to eat the very natural flesh and drink the bloud of our Lord, *I* do not see of what greater advantage it would be to us than what we may have by partaking of the Symbols of his body and bloud as he hath appointed *in remembrance of him.* For the Spiritual efficacy of the Sacrament doth not depend upon the nature of the thing received, supposing we receive what our Lord appointed, and receive it with a right preparation and disposition of mind, but upon the supernatural blessing that goes along with it, and makes it effectual to those Spiritual ends for which it was appointed.

The *Fifth* and last pretended ground of this Doctrine *is, to magnify the power of the Priest in being able to work so great a Miracle.* And this with great pride and pomp is often urged by them as a transcendent instance of the Divine Wisdom, to find out so admirable a way to raise the power and reverence of the Priest: that he should be able every day, and as often as he pleases, by repeating a few words to work so miraculous a change, and (as they love most absurdly and blasphemously to speak) *to make God himself.*

But this is to pretend to a power above that of God himself, for he did not, nor cannot make himself, nor do any thing that implies a contradiction, as *Transubstantiation* evidently does in their pretending *to make God.* For to make that which already is, and to make that now which always was, is not only vain and trifling if it could be done, but impossible because it implies a contradiction.

And what if after all *Transubstantiation*, if it were possible and actually wrought by the priest, would yet be no Miracle; For there are two things necessary to a Miracle, that there be a supernatural effect wrought, and that this effect be evident to sense. So that though a supernatural effect be wrought, yet if it be not evident to sense it is to all the ends and purposes of a Miracle as if it were not; and can be no testimony or proof of any thing, because it self stands in need of another Miracle to give testimony to it and to prove that it was wrought. And neither in Scripture, nor in profane Authours, nor in common use of speech, is any thing call'd a Miracle but what falls under the notice of our senses: A Miracle being nothing else but *a supernatural effect evident to sense*, the great end and design whereof is to be a sensible proof and conviction to us of something that we do not see.

And

And for want of this Condition, *Transubstantiation*, if it were true, would be no *Miracle*. It would indeed be very *supernatural*, but for all that it would not be a *Sign* or *Miracle*: For a Sign or Miracle, is always a thing sensible, otherwise it could be no Sign. Now that such a charge as is pretended in *Transubstantiation* should really be wrought, and yet there should be no sign and appearance of it, is a thing very wonderfull, but not to sense; for our senses perceive no change, the Bread and Wine in the Sacrament to all our senses remaining just as they were before: And that a thing should remain to all appearance just as it was, hath nothing at all of wonder in it: We wonder indeed when we see a strange thing done, but no man wonders when he sees nothing done. So that *Transubstantiation*, if they will needs have it a Miracle, is such a Miracle as any man may work that hath but the confidence to face men down that he works it, and the fortune to be believed: And though the Church of *Rome* may magnify their Priests upon account of this *Miracle*, which they say they can work every day and every hour, yet I cannot understand the reason of it; for when this great work (as they call it) is done, there is nothing more appears to be done than if there were no Miracle: Now such a Miracle as to all appearance is no Miracle; I see no reason why a Protestant Minister, as well as a Popish Priest, may not work as often as he pleases; or if he can but have the patience to let it alone, it will work it self. For surely nothing in the world is easier than to let a thing be as it is; and by speaking a few words over it to make it just what it was before; Every man, every day, may work ten thousand such Miracles.

And thus I have dispatch'd the First part of my Discourse, which was to consider the pretended grounds and Reasons of the Church of *Rome* for this Doctrine and to shew the weakness and insufficiency of them. I come in the

SECOND place, to produce our Objections *against it. Which will be of so much the greater force, because I have already shewn this Doctrine to be destitute of all Divine warrant and authority, and of any other sort of Ground sufficient in reason to justifie it. So that I do not now object against a Doctrine which hath a fair probability of Divine Revelation on its side, for that would weigh down all objections which did not plainly overthrow the probability and credit of its Divine Revelation: But I Object against a Doctrine by the mere will and Tyranny of Men impos'd upon the belief of Christians, without* any *evidence of* Scripture, *and against all the evidence of Reason and Sense.*

The Objections I shall reduce to these *two* Heads. *First*, the infinite scandal of this Doctrine to the Christian Religion. And *Secondly*, the monstrous and insupportable absurdity of it.

Frist,

First, *The infinite ſcandal of this Doctrine to the Chriſtian Religion.* And that upon theſe *four* accounts. 1. Of the ſtupidity of this Doctrine. 2. The real barbarouſneſs of this Sacrament and Rite of our Religion upon ſuppoſition of the truth of this Doctrine. 3. Of the cruel and bloudy conſequences of it. 4. Of the danger of Idolatry, which they are certainly guilty of, if this Doctrine be not true.

1. Upon account of *the ſtupidity of this Doctrine.* I remember that *Tully*, who was a man of very good ſenſe, inſtanceth in the conceit of *eating GOD* as the extremity of madneſs, and ſo ſtupid an apprehenſion as he thought no man was ever guilty of. **When we call,* ſays he, *the fruits of the earth Ceres, and wine Bacchus, we uſe but the common language; but do you think any man ſo mad as to believe that which he eats to be God?* It ſeems he could not believe that ſo extravagant a folly had ever entred into the mind of man: It is a very ſevere ſaying of *Averroes* the *Arabian* Philoſopher (who lived after this Doctrine was entertain'd among *Chriſtians*) and ought to make the Church of *Rome* bluſh, if ſhe can; * *I have travell'd* ſays he, *over the world, and have found divers Sects; but ſo ſottiſh a Sect or Law I never found; as is the Sect of the* Chriſtians; *becauſe with their own teeth they devour their God whom they worſhip.* It was great ſtupidity in the People of *Iſrael* to ſay, *Come let us make us Gods*, but it was civilly ſaid of them, *Let us make us Gods that may go before us*, in compariſon of the Church of *Rome*, who ſays, *Let us make a God that we may eat him.* So that upon the whole matter I cannot but wonder that they ſhould chuſe thus to expoſe Faith to the contempt of all that are endued with Reaſon. And to ſpeak the plain truth, the Chriſtian Religion was never ſo horribly expoſed to the ſcorn of Atheiſts and Infidels, as it hath been by this moſt abſurd and ſenſeleſs Doctrine. But this it was foretold that * *the Man of Sin ſhould come with power and ſigns and Lying Miracles, and with all deceiveableneſs of unrighteouſneſs*, with all the *Legerdemain* and *jugling* tricks of falſehood and impoſture; amongſt which this of *Tranſubſtantiation*, which they call a Miracle, and we a Cheat, is one of the chief: And in all probability thoſe common *jugling* words of *hocus pocus*, are nothing elſe but a corruption of *hoc eſt corpus*, by way of ridiculous imitation of the Prieſt of the Church of *Rome* in their *trick* of *Tranſubſtantiation.* Into ſuch contempt by this fooliſh Doctrine and pretended Miracle of theirs have they brought the moſt ſacred and venerable Myſtery of our Religion.

* De Nat. Deorum. *l.* 3.

* Dionyſ. Carthuſ. *in* 4. *diſt.* 10. *art.* 1.

* 2 Theſſ. 2. 10.

2. It is very ſcandalous likewiſe upon account of real *barbarouſneſs*

of

Sacrament and Rite of our Religion, upon ſuppoſition of the truth of this Doctrine. Literally to *eat the fleſh of the Son of man and to drink his bloud*, St. *Auſtine*, as I have ſhewed before, declares to be a great *impiety*. And the impiety and barbarouſneſs of the thing is not in truth extenuated, but onely the appearance of it, by its being done under the *Species of Bread and Wine*: For the thing they acknowledge is really done, and they believe that they verily eat and drink the natural fleſh and bloud of Chriſt. And what can any man do more unworthily towards his Friend? How can he poſſibly uſe him more barbarouſly, than to feaſt upon his living fleſh and bloud? It is one of the greateſt wonders in the world, that it ſhould ever enter into the minds of men to put upon our Saviour's words, ſo eaſily capable of a more convenient ſenſe and ſo neceſſarily requiring it, a meaning ſo plainly contrary to Reaſon, and ſenſe, and even to Humanity it ſelf. Had the ancient Chriſtians owned any ſuch *Doctrine*, we ſhould have heard of it from the Adverſaries of our *Religion* in every page of their Writings; and they would have deſired no greater advantage againſt the Chriſtians than to have been able to hit them in the teeth with their feaſting upon the natural fleſh & bloud of their Lord, and their God, and their beſt Friend. What endleſs triumphs would they have made upon this *Subject*? And with what confidence would they have ſet the cruelty uſed by Chriſtians in their *Sacrament*, againſt their God *Saturn's* eating his own Children, and all the cruel and bloudy Rites of their Idolatry? But that no ſuch thing was then objected by the *Heathens* to the *Chriſtians*, is to a wiſe man inſtead of a thouſand Demonſtrations that no ſuch Doctrine was then believed.

3. It is ſcandalous alſo upon account of the cruel and bloudy conſequences of this Doctrine; ſo contrary to the plain Laws of Chriſtianity, and to one great end and deſign of this Sacrament, which is to unite Chriſtians in the moſt perfect love and charity to one another: Whereas this Doctrine hath been the occaſion of the moſt barbarous and bloudy Tragedies that ever were acted in the World. For this hath been in the Church of *Rome* the great *burning Article*; and as abſurd and unreaſonable as it is, more Chriſtians have been murtherd for the denial of it than perhaps for all the other Articles of their *Religion*. And *I* think it may generally paſs for a true obſervation that all Sects are commonly moſt hot and furious for thoſe things for which there is leaſt Reaſon; for what men want of *Reaſon* for their opinions, they uſually ſupply and make up in *Rage*. And it was no more than needed to uſe this ſeverity upon this occaſion; for nothing but the cruel fear of death could in probability have driven ſo great a part of mankind into the acknowledgment of ſo unreaſonable & ſenſeleſs a *Doctrine*.

O blessed Saviour! thou best Friend and greatest lover of mankind, who can imagine thou didst ever intend that men should kill one another for not being able to believe contrary to their senses; for being unwilling to think, that thou shouldst make one of the most horrid and barbarous things that can be imagin'd, a main Duty and principal Mystery of thy Religion; for not flattering the pride and presumption of the Priest who says he can make God, and for not complying with the folly and stupidity of the People, who believe that they can eat him?

4. Upon account of the danger of *Idolatry*; which they are certainly guilty of, if this Doctrine be not true, and such a change as they pretend be not made in the Sacrament for if it be not, then they worship a Creature in stead of the Creator God blessed for ever. But such a change *I* have shewn to be impossible; or if it could be, yet they can never be certain that it is, and consequently are alwayes in danger of *Idolatry*: And that they can never be certain that such a change is made, is evident; because, according to the express determination of the Council of *Trent*, that depends upon the mind and *intention of the Priest*, which cannot certainly be known but by Revelation, which is not pretended in this case. And if they be mistaken about this change, through the knavery or crosness of the Priest who will not *make God*, but when he thinks fit, they must not think to excuse themselves from Idolatry because they intended to worship God and not a Creature; for so the *Persians* might be excus'd from *Idolatry* in worshipping the *Sun*, because they intend to worship God and not a Creature; and so indeed we may excuse all the *Idolatry* that ever was in the World, which is nothing else but a mistake of the Diety, and upon that mistake a worshipping of something as God, which is not God.

II. Besides the infinite scandal of this Doctrine upon the accounts *I* have mentioned, *the monstrous absurdities* of it make it insupportable to any Religion. I am very well assur'd of the grounds of Religion in general, and of the Christian Religion in particular; and yet I cannot see that the foundations of any revealed Religion, are strong enough to bear the weight of so many and so great absurdities as this Doctrine of *Transubstantiation* would load it withall. And to make this evident, *I* shall not insist upon those gross contradictions, of the same Body being in so many several places at once; of our Saviour's giving away himself with his own hands to every one of his Disciples, and yet still keeping himself to himself; and a thousand more of the like nature: But to shew the absurdity of this Doctrine *I* shall only ask these few Questions.

1. *Whether*

Divine Revelation then every man hath of the falſhood of Tranſubſtantiation? Infidelity were hardly poſſible to men, if all men had the ſame evidence for the Chriſtian Religion which they have againſt Tranſubſtantiation, that is, the clear and irreſiſtible evidence of ſenſe. He that can once be brought to contradict or deny his ſenſes, is at an end of certainty; for what can a man be certain of, if he be not certain of what he ſees? In ſome circumſtances our ſenſes may deceive us, but no Faculty deceives us ſo little and ſo ſeldom: And when our ſenſes do deceive us, even that errour is not to be corrected without the help of our ſenſes.

2. Suppoſing this Doctrine had been delivered in Scripture in the very ſame words that it is decreed in the Council of Trent. By what clearer evidence or ſtronger Argument could any man prove to me that ſuch words were in the Bible than I can prove to him that bread and Wine after conſecration are bread and wine ſtill? He could but appeal to my eyes to prove ſuch words to be in the Bible, and with the ſame reaſon and juſtice might I appeal to ſeveral of his ſenſes to prove to him that the bread and wine after conſecration are bread and wine ſtill.

3. Whether it be reaſonable to imagine that God ſhould make that a part of the Chriſtian Religion which ſhakes the main external evidence and confirmation of the whole? I mean the Miracles which were wrought by our Saviour and his Apoſtles, the aſſurance wherefore did at firſt depend upon the certainty of ſenſe. For if the ſenſes of thoſe who ſay they ſaw them were deceived then there might be no Miracle wrought; and conſequently it may juſtly be doubted whether that kind of confirmation which God hath given to the Chriſtian Religion would be ſtrong enough to prove it, ſuppoſing Tranſubſtantiation to be a part of it? Becauſe every man hath as great evidence that Tranſubſtantiation is falſe, as he hath that the Chriſtian Religion is true. Suppoſe then Tranſubſtantiation to be part of the Chriſtian Doctrine, it muſt have the ſame confirmation with the whole, and that is Miracles; But of all Doctrines in the world it is peculiarly incapable of being proved by a Miracle. For if a Miracle were wrought for the proof of it, the ſame aſſurance which any man hath of the truth of the Miracle he hath of the falſhood of the Doctrine, that is, the clear evidence of his ſenſes. For that there is a Miracle wrought to prove that what he ſees in the Sacrament is not bread but the body of Chriſt, there is only the evidence of ſenſe; and there is the very ſame evidence to prove that what he ſees in the Sacrament is not the body of Chriſt but bread. So that here would ariſe a new Controverſie, whether a man ſhould rather believe his Senſes giving teſtimony againſt the Doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation, or bearing witneſs to a Miracle wrought to confirm that Doctrine, there being the very ſame evidence againſt the truth of the Miracle? And then the Argument for Tranſubſtantiation and the Objection againſt it would

juſt

proved by a Miracle, because that would be, to prove to a man b some thing that he ſees, that he doth not ſee what he ſees. *And if there were no other evidence that* Tranſubſtantiation *is no part of the Chriſtian Doctrine, this would be ſufficient, that what proves the one, doth as much overthrow the other; and that Miracles which are certainly the beſt and higheſt external proof of Chriſtianity are the worſt proof in the world of* Tranſubſtantiation, *unleſs a man can renounce his ſenſes at the ſame time that he relies upon them. For a man cannot believe a Miracle without relying upon ſenſe, nor* Tranſubſtantiation *without renouncing it. So that never were any two things ſo ill coupled together as the Doctrine of Chriſtianity and that of* Tranſubſtantiation, *becauſe they draw ſeveral ways, and are ready to ſtrangle one another; becauſe the main evidence of the Chriſtian Doctrine, which is Miracles, is reſolved into the certainty of ſenſe, but this evidence is clear and point-blank againſt* Tranſubſtantiation.

4. And *Laſtly*, I would ask what we are to think of the Argument which our *Saviour* uſed to convince his Diſciples after his Reſurrection that his Body was really riſen, and that they were not deluded by a *Ghoſt* or Apparition? Is it a neceſſary and concluſive Argument or not? * *And he ſaid unto them, why are ye troubled? and why do thoughts ariſe in your hearts? Behold my hands and my feet, that it is I my ſelf; for a Spirit hath not fleſh and bones, as ye ſee me have.* But now if we ſuppoſe with the Church of *Rome* the Doctrine of *Tranſubſtantiation* to be true, and that he had inſtructed his Diſciples in it juſt before his death, ſtrange thoughts might juſtly have riſen in their hearts, and they might have ſaid to him, Lord, it is but a few dayes ago ſince thou didſt teach us not to believe our ſenſes, but directly contrary to what we ſaw, *viz.* That the bread which thou gaveſt us in the *Sacrament*, though we ſaw it, and handled it, and taſted it, to be bread, yet was not bread, but thine own natural body, and now thou appealeſt to our ſenſes to prove that this is thy body which we now ſee. If ſeeing and handling be an unqueſtionable evidence that things are what they appear to our ſenſes, then we were deceived before in the *Sacrament*; and if they be not, then we are not ſure now that this is thy body which we now ſee and handle, but it may be perhaps bread under the appearance of fleſh and bones, juſt as in the *Sacrament*, that which we ſaw and handled and taſted to be bread was thy fleſh and bones under the form and appearance of bread. Now upon this ſuppoſition, it would have been a hard matter to have quieted the thoughts of the Diſciples: For if the Argument which our *Saviour* uſed did certainly prove to them that what

* Luke 24. 38, 39.

they

they saw and handled was his body, his very natural flesh and bones; because they saw and handled them, (which it were impious to deny) it would as strongly prove that what they saw and received before in the Sacrament was not the natural body and blood of *Christ*, but real bread and wine. And consequently, that according to our Saviours arguing after his Resurrection they had no reason to believe *Transubstantiation* before. For that very Argument by which our Saviour proves the reality of his body after his Resurrection doth as strongly prove the reality of bread and wine after Consecration. But our Saviour's Argument was most infallibly good and true, and therefore the Doctrine of *Transubstantiation* is undoubtedly false.

Upon the whole matter I shall only say this, that some other Points between us and the Church of *Rome* are managed with some kind of wit and subtilty, but this of *Transubstantiation* is carried out by mere dint of impudence and facing down of Mankind.

And of this the more discerning persons of that Church are of late grown so sensible that they would now be glad to be rid of this odious and ridiculous Doctrine. But the Council of *Trent* hath fastned it to their Religion, and made it a necessary and essential Point of their Belief, and they cannot now part with it if they would; 'tis like a Mill-stone hung about the neck of Popery which will sink it at the last.

Though some of their greatest Wits, as Cardinal *Perron* of late Monsieur *Arnaud*, have undertaken the defence of it in great Volumes; yet it is an absurdity of that monstrous and massy weight, that no humane authority or wit are able to support it: It will make the very Pillars of St. *Peter's* crack, and requires more Volumes to make it good than would fill the *Vatican*.

And now I would apply my self to the poor deluded People of that Church, if they were either permitted by their Priests, or durst venture without their leave to look into their Religion and to examine the Doctrines of it. *Consider, and shew your selves men.* Do not suffer your selves any longer to be led blindfold, and by an implicit Faith in your Priests, into the belief of nonsense and contradiction. Think it enough and too much to let them rook you of your mony for pretended Pardons and counterfeit Reliques, but let not the Authority of any Priest or Church persuade you out of your Senses. *Credulity is certainly a fault as well as Infidelity: and he who said, blessed are they that have not seen and yet have believed*, hath no where said, *blessed are they that have seen and yet have not believed*, much less,

To conclude this Discourse. By what hath been said upon this Argument it will appear, with how little truth, and reason, and regard to the interest of our common Christianity, it is so often said by our Adversaries, that there are as good arguments for the belief of *Transubstantiation* as of the Doctrine of the *Trinity*. When they themselves do acknowledge with us that the Doctrine of the *Trinity* is grounded upon the Scriptures, and that according to the interpretation of it by the consent of the ancient Fathers: But the Doctrine of *Transubstantiation* I have plainly shown to have no such ground, and that this is acknowledged by very many learned men of their own Church. And this Doctrine of theirs being first plainly proved by us to be destitute of all Divine Warrant and Authority, our Objections against it from the manifold contradictions of it to Reason and Sense, and many Demonstrations of the falsehood of it, &c. Against all which they have nothing to put in the opposite Scale but the Infallibility of the Church, for which there is even less colour of proof from Scripture than for *Transubstantiation* it self. But so fond are they of their own Innovations and Errours, that rather than the Dictates of their Church, how groundless and absurd soever, should be call'd in question, they had rather than not have their will of us in imposing upon us such things as they will overthrow any Article of the Christian Faith, and the very foundations of our common Religion. And that evidently the Church of *Rome* is not the true Mother Church she can be pretended that Christianity should be destroyed rather than the point in question should be decided against her.